Study of Institutional Organizational Climate as Perceived by Teachers Teaching at Different Grade Levels

K.S. Misra

Dean, Faculty of Arts, University of Allahabad, Uttar Pradesh, India

Corresponding author: ksmisra1955@yahoo.co.in

ABSTRACT

This study has been done to compare the institutional organizational climate as perceived by teachers teaching at different grade levels. To begin with a scale was prepared to measure teachers' perception of their interactions with the principal or the head of the department (in case of universities) of their institutions with respect to six dimensions, viz.- Openness, Favouritism, Humane, Task orientation, Apathy, and Control. Sample consisted of 112 teachers. Findings reveled that with increase in grade level of students taught by teachers, their perception of apathy, task orientation ,and openness in institutional climate decreases. But it does not influence perception of humane climate and control.

Keywords: Organizational climate, grade level, construction

Physical and material aspects, social interactions, organizational and administrative structure and values/ belief systems/norms/ thinking styles prevalent in institutions can provide a safe and orderly environment for teachers and other employees working in an institution. Every formal educational institution is characterized by a specific organizational climate which can differentiate it from other institutions. Employees perceive the behaviour and work of the principal/ head master or the head of the department. This perception denotes the work environment of the organization i.e. organizational climate. Tagiuri (1968) thought that organizational climate consists of four components: ecology, milieu, social system and culture. According to Pemarupan *et al.* (2013) organizational climate is actually related to traits or characters that are felt and contained within the scope of work and which may affect the behavior of organizational members. Maxwell thought that organizational climate of an

educational institution refers to physical and non-physical organizational condition perceived by teachers. It points to the human environment in which employees do their work. Wilson and Rosenfeld (1990) think that organizational climate is a perception of teachers about properties related to quality and suitability of wok environment in an educational institution. Organizational climate of an educational institution may be defensive or supportive, task oriented or relationship oriented, facilitative or inhibitive, procedure oriented or vision oriented, problem centred or solution centred, humane or empathy-neutral, individual centred or group centred, conservative or risk taking, evaluative or lackadaisical, patronage oriented or impartial.

Teachers and non-teaching staff of an educational institution respond to their cognitive representations of the characteristics of the psychological atmosphere of the institution. This organizational climate of the institution can affect behavior and attitudes of members in organization (Len & Lee, 2017). It can influence the effectiveness of schools, colleges and departments of universities. It can affect teaching-attitudes, organizational expectations, morale, work engagement, job satisfaction and well being of teachers working in institutions. Gemnafle, Waimuri and Batlolona (2015) found that organizational climate is one factor that significantly contributes to teacher performance. Positive school organizational climate encourages teachers to devote everything they have relating to aspects of knowledge or mind, energy, time, commitment, alignment and sense of professionalism, responsibility to improve students' achievement. Guha (2016) found that organizational climate as perceived by male rural teacher educators is better than that of female rural teacher educators. Organizational climate can predict organizational commitment and perceived organizational performance (Berberoglu, 2018). Ghosh and Joshi (2017) found that there is a significant difference in the way both senior and junior academics experience their organizational climate. Ghavifekr and Pillai (2016) reported that secondary schools have a positive and open climate with the professional teachers' behavior factor as the biggest contributor. Aghar (2008) found that scores on organizational climate can predict occupational stress. Among teachers working in the disengaged and closed climate, the rate of organizational climate significantly exceeds that recorded among the teachers working in open climate. Ceyda and Sevinc (2012) concluded that gender and seniority have meaningful relation with organizational climate.

Researchers have been trying to study the effects of organizational climate on organizational and teacher-outcomes. They have employed objective as well as perceptual measures. Perceptual measures have been more used. Organizational Climate Descriptive Questionnaire (OCDQ) developed by Halpin and Croft (1963) has been the most popular. They measured teacher-teacher and teacher-principal interactions in schools. OCDQ measures eight factors or dimensions. Four dimensions are related to the characteristics of the faculty group, and four are related to the principal-teacher interactions. These eight dimensions of organizational climate are – Disengagement, Hindrance, Esprit, Intimacy, Aloofness, Production Emphasis, Thrust

and Consideration. The author decided to prepare a scale to measure teachers' perception of their interactions with the principal or the head of the department (in case of universities) of their institutions with respect to six dimensions, viz.- Openness, Favouritism, Humane, Task orientation, Apathy, and Control.

Item analysis for Institutional Organizational Climate Scale

To begin with the researcher constructed ten items for measuring each dimension of the organizational climate of educational institutions. Construction of items was based on researcher's experience as a teacher, Head of the department and Dean of the faculty. There were 60 items and the response alternatives were – 'completely agree, agree, disagree or completely disagree'. The try-out form was administered on a sample of 112 teachers teaching in primary, upper primary, high school, intermediate and degree colleges/ university. Responses were scored by awarding a score of '5, 4, 3, 2, 1' for 'completely agree, agree undecided, disagree or completely disagree' respectively. Scores on various items were added together to get a dimension score. It was hypothesized that items belonging to a particular dimension will have a higher positive correlation with the relevant dimension than with other dimension scores. The values of all item-dimension score correlations have been shown in table 1. Six items with higher item-dimension score correlation were selected in such a way that their correlation with other dimensions is lesser as compared to the item-dimension correlation. This resulted in selection of 36 items for the final form of Institutional Climate Scale.

Comparison of organizational climate of institutions of different levels

It was hypothesized that teachers teaching in different grade levels in educational institutions differ from one another on various dimensions of organizational climate. Observation of table 3 shows that out of six, five F-ratios are significant. They reveal existence of significant differences in openness (F= 9.003, df=3, 108, p<.01), favouritiusm (F= 10.417, df=3, 108, p<.01), task orientation (F= 29.089, df=3, 108, p<.01), apathy (F= 52.184, df=3, 108, p<.01), and control (F= 4.355, df=3, 108, p<.01). No difference exists among teachers teaching at different grade levels with reference to humane dimension of organizational climate (F= 1.519, df=3, 108, p>.01). Further comparisons were done using LSD test. Results have been shown in table 3. They reveal that (1) as compared to teachers teaching at primary level, teachers teaching at secondary level perceive more openness in their institutions, (2) as compared to teachers teaching at primary level, teachers teaching at higher level perceive less openness in their institutions, (3) as compared to teachers teaching at upper primary level primary level, teachers teaching at secondary or higher level perceive less openness in their institutions, (4) as compared to teachers teaching at secondary level, teachers teaching at secondary level perceive less openness in their institutions, (5) as compared to teachers teaching at primary level, teachers teaching at secondary/higher level perceive less task orientation in their institutions, (6) as

compared to teachers teaching at upper primary level primary level, teachers teaching at secondary or higher level perceive less task orientation in their institutions, (7) there is no difference in task orientation as perceived by teachers teaching at primary or upper primary level and secondary or higher level, (8) as compared to teachers teaching at primary level, teachers teaching at upper primary/secondary level perceive less apathy in their institutions, (9) as compared to teachers teaching at upper primary level, teachers teaching at secondary or higher level perceive less apathy in their institutions, (11) there is no difference in apathy as perceived by teachers teaching at primary or upper primary level and secondary or higher level, (12) as compared to teachers teaching at primary level, teachers teaching at secondary level perceive less control in their institutions and (13) there is no difference in control as perceived by teachers teaching at primary or upper primary 7 higher level; upper primary or secondary/higher and secondary or higher level.

This study has shown that teachers teaching at different levels perceive equally humane climate in their institutions. This reflects the importance being assigned to teaching of human rights, and the rise of activism amongst teachers at all levels against their exploitation. Teachers at secondary level perceived less control than those at primary level. This shows that heads of the institutions find it difficult to control teachers teaching at secondary and higher secondary level. Generally teachers teaching at primary level are subjected to tremendous stresses of various types, role conflicts and the pressure to try to ensure attainment of minimum levels of learning by the students. Teachers teaching at primary or upper primary level perceived more apathy in their institutional climate than teachers teaching at secondary or higher level. It implies that with increase in grade level of students taught, teachers' perception of apathy in institutional climate decreases. Teachers teaching at primary or upper primary level perceived more task orientation in their institutional climate than teachers teaching at secondary or higher level. This finding is very disturbing. Perhaps this explains the deterioration of educational standards. It also reflects the thrust perceived by students studying at secondary or higher levels for tuition and coaching. It implies the need to curb the practice of coaching and tuition by teachers. Efforts are to be made to increase task orientation among teachers teaching at secondary or higher levels. Mandatory nature of leadership development courses for principals and heads of department if practiced seriously with a sense of accountability by the organizers and participants, may give the dividends. Teachers teaching at primary or upper primary level perceived more openness in their institutional climate than teachers teaching at secondary or higher level. It implies that with increase in grade level of students taught, teachers' perception of openness in institutional climate decreases. This requires a drastic overhaul of education system by thrust on open-mindedness among teachers as well as heads of institutions or departments. This will be possible only when real democratic function is ensured in educational institutions and heads of institutions give up the tendency to impose their decisions and ignore the views of teachers in the management of the institutions.

Table 1: Correlations between item-score and scores on various dimensions of Institutional Organizational Climate Inventory

Item no.	Open	Favouritism	Humane	Task orientation	Apathy	Control	Item no in final form
1	.017	-.039	.268**	-.114	-.169	-.252*	
2	.264**	.641**	.252*	.357**	.390**	.278**	2
3	.021	.007	.444**	-.077	-.081	-.106	33
4	.027	-.043	.354**	.059	-.118	-.028	
5	.225*	.386**	.159	.631**	.781**	.202*	17
6	.413**	.258**	.066	.296**	.314**	.589**	6
7	.416**	.071	.087	-.154	-.206*	.242*	19
8	.166	.418**	.006	-.191	-.129	.050	
9	.100	.066	.538**	.201*	.038	.280**	15
10	.129	.091	.339**	.440**	.085	.279**	28
11	-.190	-.013	.115	-.287**	-.023	-.028	
12	-.179	.035	.280**	-.139	-.070	.012	
13	.206*	-.065	.111	.059	.062	.011	
14	.019	.437**	.146	-.112	-.109	-.032	32
15	.021	.081	.417**	.073	.078	.240*	
16	.287**	.116	.225*	.137	-.089	.156	
17	.012	.139	.037	-.056	.208*	.010	
18	-.045	.120	.077	-.199*	-.211*	.023	
19	.141	.059	.296**	.237*	.137	.262**	
20	.185	.357**	.052	-.090	-.147	.089	
21	.153	.049	.601**	.252*	.010	.218*	3
22	-.016	-.093	.262**	.177	-.226*	.053	
23	-.141	.177	.126	-.190	-.219*	-.172	
24	.250*	.196	.234*	.138	-.048	.512**	24
25	.670**	.367**	-.036	.466**	.374**	.210*	1
26	.267**	.604**	-.005	.552**	.652**	.341**	20
27	-.190	.070	.363**	-.063	-.023	.028	
28	.281**	.269**	-.079	.600**	.657**	.113	22
29	.016	.084	-.112	.406**	.584**	.074	35
30	.185	.225*	.022	.344**	.383**	.503**	36
31	.508**	.222*	-.271**	.216*	.300**	.165	13
32	.283**	.424**	.149	.161	.386**	.368**	
33	-.155	-.160	.472**	.035	-.194	-.034	

34	-.045	-.012	.381**	.265**	-.121	-.008	34
35	.243*	.333**	.270**	.431**	.623**	.323**	
36	.355**	.274**	.115	.190	.095	.655**	12
37	.096	-.129	.148	.115	.049	.246*	
38	.091	.185	.125	.252*	.241*	.239*	
39	-.109	.222*	.537**	.120	.110	.253*	21
40	.322**	.459**	.005	.719**	.595**	.255*	10
41	.333**	.417**	.108	.627**	.844**	.240*	11
42	.174	.046	.203*	.291**	.217*	.468**	30
43	.631**	.427**	-.075	.558**	.417**	.273**	7
44	.128	.493**	.234*	.364**	.431**	.169	26
45	.082	.194	.621**	.226*	.071	.317**	9
46	.314**	.328**	.104	.748**	.663**	.231*	4
47	.354**	.408**	.124	.619**	.845**	.299**	5
48	.157	.243*	.336**	.165	.248*	.544**	18
49	.417**	.154	-.002	.158	.145	.043	25
50	.212*	.613**	.193	.498**	.574**	.207*	8
51	.279**	.232*	.486**	.161	.141	.165	27
52	.312**	.309**	.078	.654**	.702**	.146	16
53	.190	.404**	.137	.579**	.717**	.035	29
54	.306**	.224*	.066	.138	.115	.507**	
55	.361**	.221*	.285**	.038	-.033	.366**	31
56	.273**	.552**	.015	.236*	.128	.290**	14
57	.286**	.286**	.274**	.540**	.499**	.217*	
58	.046	.092	.256*	.086	-.071	.059	
59	.246*	.356**	.042	.456**	.728**	.218*	23
60	.064	.173	.246*	.109	-.048	.383**	

*/** significant at .05/.01 level.

Table 2: Showing results of ANOVA for finding out organizational climate of primary, secondary and higher level educational institutions

Dimension of organizational climate	Source of variation	Sum of squares	df	Mean sum of squares	F ratio
Open	Between Groups	416.479	3	138.826	9.003**
	Within Groups	1665.297	108	15.419	
Favouritism	Between Groups	777.556	3	259.185	10.417**
	Within Groups	2687.221	108	24.882	

Humane	Between Groups	86.507	3	28.836	1.519
	Within Groups	2050.770	108	18.989	
Task orientation	Between Groups	1011.406	3	337.135	29.089**
	Within Groups	1251.701	108	11.590	
Apathy	Between Groups	2723.549	3	907.850	52.184**
	Within Groups	1878.871	108	17.397	
Control	Between Groups	202.746	3	67.582	4.355**
	Within Groups	1660.335	107	15.517	

** significant at .05 level.

Table 3: Mean differences showing differences in organizational climate perceived by teachers of various institutional levels

Dependent Variable	Institutional level		Mean	Level of significance
	Group 1	**Group 2**	**Difference 1 - 2**	
Open	Primary	UP	0.623	
	Primary	Sec	2.7855*	0.01
	Primary	Higher	-5.55556*	0.01
	UP	Sec	-3.40857*	0.01
	UP	Higher	-6.17857*	0.01
	Sec	Higher	-2.77000*	0.05
Humane	Primary	UP	-0.19841	
	Primary	Sec	-1.15556	
	Primary	Higher	-2.88889*	0.05
	UP	Sec	-0.95714	
	UP	Higher	-2.69048	
	Sec	Higher	-1.73333	
Task orientation	Primary	UP	0.55952	
	Primary	Sec	-6.02333*	0.01
	Primary	Higher	-5.16667*	0.01
	UP	Sec	-6.58286*	0.01
	UP	Higher	-5.72619*	0.01
	Sec	Higher	0.85667	
Apathy	Primary	UP	1.65079	
	Primary	Sec	-9.43778*	0.01
	Primary	Higher	-9.27778*	0.01

	UP	Sec	-11.08857*	0.01
	UP	Higher	-10.92857*	0.01
	Sec	Higher	0.16	
Control	Primary	UP	-1.44048	
	Primary	Sec	-3.11395*	0.01
	Primary	Higher	-1.75	
	UP	Sec	-1.67347	–
	UP	Higher	-0.30952	
	Sec	Higher	1.36395	

REFERENCES

Aghar, G. 2008. The role of school organizational climate in occupational stress among secondary school teachers in Tehran. *International Journal of Occup. Med. Environ. Health*, **21**(4): 319-329.

Berberoglu, A. 2018. Impact of organizational climate on organizational commitment and perceived organizational performance: Empirical evidence from public hospitals. BMC Health Services Research. Retrieved fromhttp://bmchealthservices. biomedcentral.com on 20.07.2019.

Ceyda, G. & Sevinc, P. 2012. Determination of high schools' organizational climate. *Procedia: Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 46, 294250. Retrieved from http://reader.sciencedirect.com

Gemnafle, M., Waimuri, S.P. & Batlolona, J.R. 2018. Organizational climate of the school and teaching performance improvement in 21st century. *International Journal of Science and Research*, **7**(2): 120-126.

Ghavifekr, S. & Pillai, J.S. 2016. The relationship between schools' organizational climate and teachers' job satisfaction: Malaysian experience. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, **17**(1): 97-106.

Ghosh, S. & Joshi, P. 2017. Organizational climate and job satisfaction among academic staff in private universities of western Uttar Pradesh, Delhi and Noida. *Int. J. Trends in Res. & Dev.*, 4(1), 153-158.

Guha, A. 2016. Organizational climate of teacher education institutions in West Bengal in relation to teacher educators' motivation to work. Retrieved from www. Research Gate.net on 20.07.2019.

Halpin, A.W. & Croft, D.B. 1962. *The Organizational Climate of Schools*. Chicago: Midwest Administration Centre of the University of Chicago.

Lin, H.C. & Lee, Y.D. 2017. A study of the influence of organizational learning on employees' innovative behgaviour and work engagement by a cross-level examination. *Eurasia Journal of Mathematics, Science & Technology Education*, **13**(7): 3463-3478.

Maxwell, L.E. 2016. School building condition, social climate, student attendance and academic achievement: A mediation model. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, **46**: 206-216.

Owens, R.G. 1991. Organizational Behaviour in Education (4th Ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Permarupam, P.Y., Al-Mamun, A., Saufi, R.A. & Zainol, N.R.B. 2013. Organizational climate and employees work passion: A review. *Canadian Social Science*, **9**(4): 63-68.

Taguiri, R. 1968. The concept of organizational climate. In R. Taiguiri & G. Litwin (Eds.). *Organizational Climate*. Boston: Harvard university Press.

Wilson, D.C. & Rosenfeld, R.A. 1990. *Managing Organizations*. London: McGraw Hill.